

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/759,628	01/12/2001	David L. Gilmour	003886.P018	2386	
	75	7590 07/28/2005		EXAMINER WOO, ISAAC M		
	Andre L. Mara	ais				
	BLAKELY, SC	Y, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			_	
12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	Los Angeles, C	CA 90025		2162		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/759,628	GILMOUR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Isaac M. Woo	2162		

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	Isaac M. Woo	2162			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
HE REPLY FILED 12 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL). which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the s after the mailing date of the final rejection) and the appropriate exte The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) on, even if timely filed, ma	ension fee have on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) by reduce any		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally re	TE below); educing or simplifying			
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324) Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-14 and 26-29.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing	nd sufficient reasons why the affida g a Notice of Appeal, but prior to th	vit or other evidence e date of filing a brief	is necessary , will <u>not</u> be		
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. So on of the status of the claims after out the status of the application in	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(entry is below or attac n condition for allowa	ils to provide a (1). ched.		
	•				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 11. NOTE: does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments (filed on 07/12/2005) are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Desai does not disclose that the claim limitation "denied to a host computer that hosts the first profile. However Desai discloses, "The information-view-requests-sub-system 810 manages requests to access a profile information view including: accepting or denying information requested of the user by others 850; and accepting or denying information requested by the user of other members 852", see (col. 21, lines 56-67 to col. 22, lines 1-22). This teaches that a user access control system can deny to acess profile information on host computer. Thus, the applicant arguments are not persuasive and not in condition for allowance.

JEAN W. CORRIELUS PRIMARY EXAMINER